



MEETING OF THE

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Main Office

818 West Seventh Street
12th Floor
Los Angeles, California
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800
f (213) 236-1825

www.scag.ca.gov

Officers: President: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • First Vice President: Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Second Vice President: Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Immediate Past President: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County

Imperial County: Victor Carrillo, Imperial County • Jon Edney, El Centro

Los Angeles County: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County • Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County • Richard Alarcon, Los Angeles • Jim Aldinger, Manhattan Beach • Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Tony Cardenas, Los Angeles • Stan Carroll, La Habra Heights • Margaret Clark, Rosemead • Gene Daniels, Paramount • Judy Dunlap, Inglewood • Rae Gabelich, Long Beach • David Gafin, Downey • Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles • Wendy Greuel, Los Angeles • Frank Gurulé, Cudahy • Janice Hahn, Los Angeles • Isadore Hall, Compton • Keith W. Hanks, Azusa • José Huizar, Los Angeles • Jim Jeffra, Lancaster • Tom LaBonge, Los Angeles • Paula Lantz, Pomona • Barbara Messina, Alhambra • Larry Nelson, Artesia • Paul Nowatka, Torrance • Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Bernard Parks, Los Angeles • Jan Perry, Los Angeles • Ed Reyes, Los Angeles • Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles • Greig Smith, Los Angeles • Tom Sykes, Walnut • Mike Ten, South Pasadena • Tonia Reyes Uranga, Long Beach • Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles • Dennis Washburn, Calabasas • Jack Weiss, Los Angeles • Herb J. Wesson, Jr., Los Angeles • Dennis Zine, Los Angeles

Orange County: Chris Norby, Orange County • Christine Barnes, La Palma • John Beauman, Brea • Lou Bone, Tustin • Debbie Cook, Huntington Beach • Leslie Daigle, Newport Beach • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Troy Edgar, Los Alamitos • Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel • Robert Hernandez, Anaheim • Sharon Quirk, Fullerton

Riverside County: Jeff Stone, Riverside County • Thomas Buckley, Lake Elsinore • Bonnie Flickinger, Moreno Valley • Ron Loveridge, Riverside • Greg Pettis, Cathedral City • Ron Roberts, Temecula

San Bernardino County: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • Lawrence Dale, Barstow • Paul Eaton, Montclair • Lee Ann Garcia, Grand Terrace • Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley • Larry McCallion, Highland • Deborah Robertson, Rialto • Alan Wapner, Ontario

Tribal Government Representative: Andrew Masiel Sr., Pechanga Band of Luiseno Indians

Ventura County: Linda Parks, Ventura County • Glen Becerra, Simi Valley • Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

Orange County Transportation Authority: Art Brown, Buena Park

Riverside County Transportation Commission: Robin Lowe, Hemet

Ventura County Transportation Commission: Keith Millhouse, Moorpark

**Monday, October 15, 2007
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**

**SCAG Offices
818 West 7th Street, 12th Floor
San Bernardino Conference Room
Los Angeles, CA 90017
213.236.1800**

**Video Conference Location
SCAG Inland Empire Office
3600 Lime Street, Suite 216
Riverside, CA 92501
(951) 784-1513**

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Ryan Kuo at 213.236.1813 or kuo@scag.ca.gov

Agendas and Minutes for the P&P TAC are also available at:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtptac/index.htm>

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

	PAGE#	TIME
<i>"Any item listed on the agenda (action or information) may be acted upon at the discretion of the Committee".</i>		
1.0 <u>CALL TO ORDER & INTRODUCTIONS</u>	Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair	
2.0 <u>PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD</u> Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Committee, must fill out and present a speaker's card to the assistant prior to speaking. A speaker's card must be turned in before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.		
3.0 <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>		
3.1 <u>Approval Items</u>		
3.1.1 <u>Approve Minutes of August 27, 2007</u> Attached		
4.0 <u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>		
4.1 <u>Standing Items</u>		
4.1.1 <u>Growth Forecast</u> <i>Presentation of the RTP Alternative– Compass Blueprint Land Use Strategy and Model/4-D Results</i>	SCAG Community Development Staff	60 min.
4.1.2 <u>Highways and Arterials</u> <i>No report</i>		
4.1.3 <u>Non-motorized / TDM</u> <i>No report</i>		
4.2 <u>Conformity Update</u> <i>Update of the transportation conformity analysis of the proposed plan</i>	Jonathan Nadler, SCAG Staff	20 min.

PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AGENDA

4.3 Summary Results of Modeling Analysis
*Preliminary results of the performance
analysis of the proposed plan*

**Tarek Hatata,
System Metrics**

20 min.

4.4 Overview of RTP Workshops
*Overview of the RTP Workshops on
Finance, Goods Movement, and Corridors*

**Naresh Amatya,
SCAG Staff**

20 min.

5.0 STAFF REPORT

No report

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held at the SCAG offices on Tuesday, October 23, 2007.

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
of the
Southern California Association of Governments

August 27, 2007

Minutes

THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.

The P&P TAC held its meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Ty Schuiling, Chair, SANBAG.

Members Present:

Ty Schuiling, Chair	SANBAG
Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
Lori Abrishami	LACMTA
Gerald Bare	Caltrans-District 7
Joanna Capelle	SCRRA
Deborah Diep	CDR / CSU Fullerton
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Bill Gayk (JiHong McDermott for)	Riverside County Transportation & Land Mgmt. Agency
Jack Humphrey	Gateway Cities COG
Paula McHargue	LAWA
Mike Labudzki	City of Burbank
Michael Litschi	OCTA
Greg Nord	OCTA
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	Orange County COG
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans-District 7
Dianna Watson	Caltrans-District 7
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies

Videoconference:

Catherine McMillan	CVAG
Arnold San Miguel	SCAG
Kevin Viera	WRCOG

Teleconference:

Rich Kuzmyak	Consultant
Rosa Lopez	IVAG

SCAG Staff:

Greg Bolen, Consultant	Darin Chidsey	Rich Macias
Tarek Hatata, Consultant	André Darmanin	Jessica Meaney
Joseph Alcock	Bob Huddy	Bev Perry
Naresh Amatyia	Keith Killough	Alan Thompson
Mike Armstrong	Ryan Kuo	Frank Wen

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ty Schuiling, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:15 am. Introductions were made.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There was no public comment.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

3.1 Approval Items

3.1.1 Approve Minutes of May 17, 2007

Members reviewed minutes and recommended the following changes:

- Page 3, paragraph 2 to read as follows: "The jobs and households would be according to the 2035 ~~SCD~~ SED forecast and would be ...". Bill
- Comments were received from Mike Labudzki, City of Burbank. Tarek Hatata, Systems Metrics will address comments during his presentation.

Motion was moved and unanimously approved with above-mentioned corrections.

4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS

4.1 Aviation/Ground Access Report

Mike Armstrong, SCAG, updated committee members on the project list changes in the Airport Ground Access Report. These changes were made as a result of recent information collected through field service, ground counts, and passenger surveys. Mr. Armstrong began by stating that the forecast for the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is similar to the 2004 RTP with few changes in forecasts for the different airports. Mr. Armstrong presented major project changes for the 2008 project list, including changes that respond to input received from local airports and local cities. He added that a concerted and deliberate attempt was made to seek input from airports and cities that are within the local airport service area.

Mr. Armstrong also provided a brief summary on how the Ground Access Analysis was conducted. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that the Ground Access Analysis is closely tied to operations that are generated by the demand forecast and include air carrier, commuter, air cargo, military, and general aviation operations. The operational forecast is used to generate passenger trips and cargo truck trips and is based on a common methodology using the Regional Airport Demand Model (RADM) methodology. The analysis is also based on a very detailed schedule of operations to determine air passenger arrivals, delays, effects on ground access, passenger arrivals, and effects on ground access systems.

Mr. Armstrong reported the following key changes in the project list:

- Due to a downscale in March Inland Port projections from 8 to 2.5, projects were dropped to the non-essential list.
- In Ontario, a few projects were completed and dropped to the non-essential list. Additional projects requested by the City include grade separations and interchange improvements.
- A grade separation at RanchoVista Blvd. and Sierra Highway. Railroad tracks were added to the list in the City of Palmdale.
- The City of Burbank includes major improvements to Hollywood Blvd. Major upgrades to the Empire interchange with a new HOV facility. A transit center and expansion of the Burbank bus transit center will also be added.
- New 4-lane bridge to alleviate congestion at San Bernardino Airport and improvements to Mountain View from Palm Meadows to I-10.
- There are a number of project modifications for LAX. This includes modifications to the improvements to Manchester, Century Blvd., and Aviation, including not widening Sepulveda (South) through the Sepulveda Tunnel and preserving space on Century for potential light rail and transit, and no left turns on Aviation. New projects include a grade separation at Douglas for the Green Line and additional left turn lanes on La Cienega at Centinela.

Mr. Armstrong stated that an aviation scenario has not been selected. These scenarios would change depending on the adoption of the High Speed Regional Transit (HSRT) System. Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, asked when a policy decision would be made regarding the selection of the High Speed Regional Transit System. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, addressed the question and stated that several workshops are being planned, one of which will focus on Aviation and the HSRT system. Mr. Amatya stated that this issue will also be discussed at the Maglev Task Force meeting, and recommendation will then be escalated to the Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC), then to the Regional Council (RC) where a decision is made. Mr. Schuiling asked if the Cambridge Systematic work on the modal alternatives analysis is timely enough to support the decision for the 2008 RTP. Miles Mitchell, LADOT, stated that the study is currently delayed due to model-related issues. Results remain to be expected by the end of the year and if a formal report is not available, there may be an interim product that is issued that can be used for the 2008 RTP.

Mr. Armstrong stated that John Wayne and Palm Springs Airports were not included in the presentation since there have not been any major changes.

4.2 2003 Base Year & 2035 Baseline Modeling Result Comparison

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics Group, addressed the questions presented by the City of Burbank. Mr. Hatata stated that in the previous month's meeting a question was raised regarding automobile accessibility as a percent of home-based work trips that are completed within 45 minutes during the PM peak periods. The percentage stays the same between 2003 Base Year and 2035 Baseline. Mr. Labudzki, City of Burbank, questioned delay and stated that in multiple presentations it was shown that delay was increasing significantly and yet accessibility stayed the same. Mr. Hatata stated that between the months of May to August, the model has changed significantly. Therefore the difference is the result of the model evolution which has changed recently since the last TAC meeting.

Mr. Labudzki added that he understood that the results were preliminary; however, the results are showing measures that reflect a phenomenon, and may not be fully explaining what assumptions are based on behind the phenomenon. Mr. Labudzki further stated that regarding the congestion in the region, the home-to-work trips, which are not voluntary, and which are the trips that are hard to remove from the system or reduce somehow, do not seem to be affected. If this is true, then there are some assumptions behind it. Mr. Labudzki referred to the Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD) memo dated August 30th, Page 70, which reads, "As congestion increases, people who live closer to work will expect shopping and services to start locating closer to their homes". He further stated that if this travel behavior does not change, then at least those two assumptions are behind it. Mr. Hatata stated that the memo from CEHD discusses a growth scenario that he is not showing since the reference item is for transit-oriented development in which people live close to work and have transit facilities to link them. What was shown in the previous meeting had not incorporated these land use changes.

Keith Killough, SCAG, described the measures and stated that the answer is in the way that the measure is constructed. The measure states that one percent of trips can reach their destination within 45 minutes. Given all the trips that will be made, what percentage of those can reach their destination? In this particular measure, of the transit trips that are made, how many can get there in 45 minutes? Regardless of how the region grows and where the destinations are located, if transit trips that are made can get where they are going in that time period then the measure will remain the same. Mr. Labudzki stated that it would be helpful to make the same estimate for how the home-to-work trips will be affected in highly urbanized areas.

Mr. Hatata continued with his presentation and stated that moving forward, "PPP Plan" will reflect the approved base growth forecast with additional planned projects from long range plans and county inputs including private participation projects. Additionally, the "2035 CTC Plan" is similar to the 2035 Plan but does not include private participation projects.

Mr. Hatata also noted the following changes in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). In the previous baseline, VMT was 555 and now increases to 573, which includes the private and public investments. For the CTC Plan, VMT drops to 566 and does not include the growth scenario and the TDM.

Mr. Hatata presented data regarding the AM Peak Period HBW Travel Time. On a SCAG-wide average, trip time increased from 28 minutes in 2003 to 31 minutes in the 2035 CTC. Mr. Hatata stated that the detail for the PPP Plan was not available; therefore it is not reflected in the chart. He went on to state that Los Angeles and Riverside account for this increase whereas in San Bernardino the average trip time decreases.

Due to congestion trip speeds Mr. Hatata stated that speeds decrease from 30 to 29 mph. This reduction is reflected in all counties. Personal hours of delay include the CTC Plan. In the CTC Plan, the personal minutes of delay per capita increases from 19 to 24.7. In the PPP Plan, this figure is in the 23 minute range.

Lori Abrishami, LACMTA, asked if the PPP Plan included constrained or total projects. Mr. Hatata stated that the PPP Plan included the Maglev system and does not include any new projects. The PPP Plan includes total projects and CTC is only constrained projects.

Mr. Hatata also discussed accessibility for transit home-based work (HBW) trips for the PM Peak period, which was slightly higher than 40% in 2003; approximately 43% of the transit trips in the PM Peak period can be completed. With the Baseline this improves to 48% and with the PPP Plan this improves to 48%. Accessibility for transit increases and accessibility for autos remains the same.

4.3 Standing Item

4.3.1 Growth Forecast

Glen Bolen, Fregonese & Associates, discussed the next steps for the Growth Visioning alternatives in the 2008 RTP. Mr. Bolen stated that staff has interviewed several cities and is looking in detail through their general plans and TAZ forecast. There are areas where our general plans need to be updated because they are not matching some of the ideas and advisory guidance from the Compass. Mr. Bolen stated that the modeling proved that a need exists for us to look at regional coordination and the way the Compass program worked to provide some of the backbone and the framework for coming up with a way that our transportation decisions work together in harmony to help us work towards a specific direction.

Mr. Bolen discussed the policy options that will be presented at the CEHD meeting. He stated that the workshop scenario is based on jurisdictional input and has been modified into the Envision Scenario that was discussed at the last TAC meeting. Staff is now going to work with the CEHD and review the policy options and use their direction to develop another draft alternative for testing.

Mr. Bolen stated that there are seven policy options to review. The first option is to identify special regional strategic areas for infill and investment. This includes small mixed use areas that may be more nodal along a corridor. Any time that a daily errand trip can be made closer to home the greater the chance for localized short trips and intra-zonal capture. The second option is to structure the plan on a 3-tier system. This option is based on existing areas that meet these criteria, planned, and to identifying potential areas for future development. Mr. Bolen stated that the third option is to develop “complete communities” since the more capacity that is created in retail areas, the less often we have to rely on the interregional system and have local trip capture and shorter distances to travel.

Mr. Bolen stated that a lesson learned from the demonstration projects is that the cities view this more nodal or more focused areas of activity with gaps in between. The fifth option is to plan for a changing demand in types of housing; explore additional growth potential. The sixth option is to continue to protect stable existing single family areas and plan for less dense development in outlying areas. The final option is to plan for additional housing and jobs within reach of transit network.

Mike Labudzki, City of Burbank, stated that the model development was based on walking access and future transit availability, for example, the success with Rapid Transit and that type of development. He stated that the nodal approach may be going behind it and that access to transit may be a key to transit development and providing more services on a frequent basis outside of the peak period so transit users can walk in to the station without having a schedule and use the transit and have convenient connections. This implies a high investment in transit and providing the transit opportunities. Corridors imply that there will be access to transit along these corridors. He asked if it will be realistic to provide good transit service frequently along major corridors. Mr. Bolen responded that there is a large amount of existing transit corridor style development, i.e. Hawthorne Blvd. Mr. Bolen explained that in sessions with other cities they were expecting a lot to happen in those stations areas. Cities were designating developments as a nucleus of activity and did not want to spread it out down the corridor.

Gail Shiomoto-Lohr, Orange County COG, referred to the CEHD staff report, pages 69 and 70, which talks about strong market forces that are being identified and the following: “Over the next 30 years accessibility will start to become more important than mobility. People will place value on the time it takes to get to work, errands and recreation rather than the speed at which they travel. As congestion increases, people will live closer to work and will expect shopping and services to start locating closer to homes.” Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr stated that this is a very bold statement and asked how the linkage came about. Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr also stated that

there are several other issues and choices that will potentially not change the current behavior i.e. where your kids go to school. Mr. Bolen stated that some of these issues with congestion, increasing and shortening trips are related to the “what if” scenario and based on the fuel price which will increase over time. Mr. Bolen also stated that there has been a documented trend of these increases in values throughout the west; there is going to be more capacity created and more housing built in areas that are more transportation efficient because of time and cost.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr stressed her concern with the final sentence given that it will be presented to a policy committee. She stated that the sentence was more of a declarative statement and more of what we desire to happen but may not occur.

Rich Kuzmyak provided members with an update on the 4D process. He stated that the following items have taken place since the last P&P TAC meeting:

- Questions on the regression models from the last P&P TAC meeting were received and were responded to,
- Met with SCAG technical committee on August 21st to detail the approach for the application,
- Caliper staff has been working on completing the programming for the application and Fregonese & Associates is working on completing the baseline.

Mr. Kuzmyak explained the approach by which the 4D process was applied at a TAZ level. The assessment of the first stage analysis is that the regional model is not sensitive to the effects of land use on household behavior. Auto ownership should be less in areas where there is good land use. The rates of auto use and average trip length should be less in those areas. An assumption is made that the four-step model will account for the macro-effects of the socioeconomic assumptions and transportation-level effects on interzonal travel. We are making an assumption that those impacts will be more pronounced on work trips. 4Ds effects are most pronounced on interzonal travel, which is primarily non-work related.

Mr. Kuzmyak added that estimates on the 4D effects will be made within a TAZ based on grid cells. Focus will be made on the amount of activity that is in those grid cells and the land use definition that is being assumed for those grid cells. This will tell us what the land use will be.

Mr. Kuzmyak stated that once Fregonese & Associates provides the data, the next steps are to quickly run a test application on Los Angeles County, review, and discuss the outcome with SCAG staff. Additionally, Mr. Kuzmyak stated that he hopes to create this program that can be included in the TRANSCAD system so that SCAG staff can run these investigations since the Caliper Corporation contract will run out at the end of September.

Tony Van Haagen, Caltrans-District 7, asked what the percentage of the interzonal travel is of the total VMT and how significant this is because greater concentration is made on the intrazonal VMT. Mr. Kuzmyak stated that land use within the zone has a very direct effect on the number of vehicles that households living there will own, and the number of trips that they will make by vehicle as opposed to walking and how long those trips will be. On average, we are reflecting that good intrazonal characteristics will bring down the average number of trips and the average VMT for that household in direct measure to how good their land use is; I am not able to provide a definite percentage. Mr. Kuzmyak stated that the TRANSCAD software designers are able to provide a more detailed presentation. Mr. Van Haagen welcomed the suggestion and further stated that a good reality check would be to test this out on the Base Year. Mr. Kuzmyak agreed.

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr asked if cities rely on a typical land use-based models and they run the land use model and look at it from what is in their general plan for specific TAZ's, and in relation to what is being proposed as part of Envision, if these land use models do not have the factors to adjust, and we will be looking at this from a specific trip perspective and with traditional ITE trip generation rates that are applicable to that jurisdiction, could you actually have a worst case scenario where the number of trips based on those different specific uses is more than what is coming from the Baseline scenario because of the trip generation component? Then the issue is where in the EIR have you analyzed the worst case scenario if there is a scenario that could be worse if people do not change their trip behavior from the typical ITE trip generation rates? What would be the impact to the local circulation system within that TAZ as a result of the additional trips?

Mr. Kuzmyak stated that one thing we need to expect is that as we move massive blocks of housing, if we have a TAZ that is going to get a lot of land use treatment with density and base around transit, then we'll want to put more jobs and housing in those areas to take advantage of the transportation efficiency. If we increased the activity then you'll see more vehicle trips, but then you need to look at the area. Is the increase and efficiency from those areas enough to counter-balance our relatively high rates of production of VMT outside the blueprint areas from a smaller number of households and jobs that are producing it? Knowing what you are going to deal with, you can begin to look at mitigation remedies that will allow you to look at mood shift or traffic generalization.

Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr stated that there will be localized impacts to the circulation impact that are not quantified and integrated in the cost scenarios that are identified; they will be occurring in existing developed areas where there is a great potential where the capacity needs to handle the increase in traffic will be very expensive or not doable. There needs to be a local perspective side that is not in here but will be very real to those jurisdictions who all of a sudden propose to get a lot more housing and employment in traffic analysis zones that for all intents and purposes are developed.

5.0 STAFF REPORT

6.0 ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schuiling adjourned the meeting at 1:05 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee is to be decided.